

REMARKS

In the official action mailed on **29 October 2008**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-3, 5-13, 15-23, and 25-32. Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5-13, 15-23, and 25-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Atkinson et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0012329, hereinafter “Atkinson”), Chang et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0083121, hereinafter “Chang”), and Hamilton, II et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,107,330, hereinafter “Hamilton”).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Examiner rejected independent claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 were under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on Atkinson, Chang, and Hamilton.

Applicant respectfully points out that the combined system of Atkinson, Chang, and Hamilton fails to teach that **the service provider provides the client with a dynamic extension profile, which allows the client to dynamically acquire other service profiles when they are needed.**

More specifically, a dynamic extension profile is a service profile that facilitates the dynamic acquisition of profiles as they are needed. This is because a dynamic extension profile provides commands that allow a first device to query second device to determine which profile implementations are available on the second device. It also provides commands to transfer profile implementations from the second device to the first device. By providing a dynamic extension profile to the client device, the service provider provides the client device the capability and extendibility to acquire additional profiles if they are needed (see par. [0031]-[0033] of the instant application).

In contrast, the combined system of Atkinson, Chang, and Hamilton is directed to requesting and receiving a conventional service profile from a service provide to the client device (see Atkinson par. [0102], “*If it is determined that the first device does not have a print profile installed, the printer could be used to send the appropriate profile the first deice.*”) However, the combined system of

Atkinson, Chang, and Hamilton fails to disclose that a client device receives a dynamic extension profile from the service provide, wherein this dynamic extension profile is used to acquire other profiles if they are needed. **In other words, the combined system of Atkinson, Chang, and Hamilton does not disclose a dynamic extension device profile having the ability to acquire other service profiles, and does not disclose that a service provider provides such a dynamic extension profile to the requesting client.**

Hence, there is nothing within Atkinson, Chang, and Hamilton, either separately or in concert, which suggests that **the service provider provides the client with a dynamic extension profile, which allows the client to dynamically acquire other service profiles when they are needed.**

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 to clarify that in the instant application, **the service provider provides the client with a service profile, which is a dynamic extension profile, wherein this dynamic extension allows the client to dynamically acquire other service profiles when they are needed.** These amendments find support in par. [0031]-[0033] of the instant application. No new matter has been added.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-3 and 5-10, which depend upon claim 1, claims 12-13 and 15-20, which depend upon claim 11, claims 22-23 and 25-30, which depend upon claim 21, and claim 32, which depends upon claim 31, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Shun Yao/
Shun Yao
Registration No. 59,242

Date: 29 January 2009

Shun Yao
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1667
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: shun@parklegal.com